



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/227,398	01/08/1999	KENT K. LEUNG	CISCP077	8362

22434 7590 02/27/2002

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP  
P.O. BOX 778  
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

MEHRPOUR, NAGHMEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2685

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**09/227,389**Applicant(s)  
**Kent K. Leung**Examiner  
**Naghmeh Mehrpour**Art Unit  
**2685**

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Jan 31, 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_

5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).

6. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
please see the attachment.

7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-40

9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

11. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit:

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/31/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Applicant was unable to locate a reference in RFC 2002 that disclose sending a counter associated with a mobile node's activity to a server adapted for recording accounting information associated with the mobile node. Rather, page 15 lines 1-5 of Applicant's reference copy of RFC 2002 relates to agent advertisement and solicitation messages, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's argument that "*A registration reply neither disclose nor suggests acknowledging logging of accounting information pertaining to a mobile node in response to an accounting request including at least one counter associated with the accounting information.*"

Examiner responds that when a mobile registers to the Base station the acknowledgment response is a well known feature in the mobile system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching to the admitted prior art, in order to let the mobile know that the registration is complete. In addition acknowledging of logging of accounting information in response to an accounting

Art Unit:


request including a counter with the accounting information is a design choice and can be done by writing a simple software.

In response to applicant's argument regarding Claims 12, 22, 36, that Applicant was unable to locate reference to TACAS+ or RADIUS server on page 10 lines 7-10 of RFC 2002. Since there is no numbering on the page 10, the Examiner suggests that Applicant read the whole page 10 of the document.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the admitted prior art fails to teach a server wherein the server is a TACACS + or a RADIUS server. However RFC 2002 Mobile IP publication teaches a server wherein the server is a TACACS + or a RADIUS server (Page 10 lines 7-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of RFC to the admitted prior art, in order to provide security association for registration authentication.

NM

Feb 25, 2002

  
EDWARD F. URBAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600